

REMARKS

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-16, 18, and 20 are now present in this application. Claims 1, 8, 15, 18, and 20 are independent.

Claims 17 and 19 have been canceled, and claims 1, 2, 4, 8, 9, 11, and 20 have been amended. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 2, 4-7, 9, and 11-14 contain allowable subject matter.

Accordingly, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 8 to incorporate subject matter from allowable claims 2 and 9, respectively. Applicants submit that the scope of the subject matter from claims 2 and 9, as incorporated into claims 1 and 8, remains unchanged.

Priority Under 35 U.S.C. § 119

The Examiner has not acknowledged Applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119, and receipt of the certified priority document. Acknowledgment thereof by the Examiner in the next Office Action is respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully submit that the certified copy of the Priority Document was made available under the PCT. We note that we checked PAIR and the Priority Document is present in the Image File Wrapper. Acknowledgment of receipt of the certified Priority Document is respectfully requested in the next Office Action.

Information Disclosure Citation

Each of the Information Disclosure Statements filed by Applicants to date have been considered by the Examiner, and initialed PTO-SB08 forms have been provided by the Examiner. Therefore, no outstanding issues remain with respect to the consideration of Information Disclosure Statements.

Drawings

Since no objection has been received, Applicant assumes that the drawings are acceptable and that no further action is necessary. Confirmation thereof in the next Office Action is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101

Claim 19 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as not falling within a statutory category of invention. Applicants have canceled claim 19. Applicants submit that the rejection is no longer applicable.

Claim Objections

The Examiner has objected to claims 3, 10, and 20 because of informalities. Applicants have amended claims 1 and 8 to incorporate subject matter of claims 2 and 9, respectively. Applicants submit that as a result of this amendment, proper antecedent basis is provided for terms in claims 3 and 10.

With respect to claim 20, Applicants note that support is provided for “computer readable recording medium” of claim 20 at least because claim 20 constituted part of the original disclosure.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd Paragraph

Claims 4-7 and 11-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd Paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner has set forth certain instances wherein the claim language lacks antecedent basis.

In order to overcome this rejection, Applicants have amended claims 4 and 11 to correct each of the deficiencies specifically pointed out by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims, as amended, particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Application Publication 2003/0120742 (Ohgami). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A complete discussion of the Examiner's rejection is set forth in the Office Action, and is not being repeated here.

While not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to advance prosecution of the instant application, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 17 has been cancelled, thus rendering this rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) moot. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 3, 8, 10, 15, 16, and 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohgami in view of GB 2343334 (Cho). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A complete discussion of the Examiner's rejection is set forth in the Office Action, and is not being repeated here.

It is noted that the Examiner indicates that arguments for claims 1 and 8 apply as well to claim 15. The Examiner also indicates that claim 18 recites a method that is comparable to the apparatus or device of claims 1 and 8.

However, unlike claims 1 and 8, claim 15 recites that a display format is changed according to the recognition information signal. Also unlike claims 1 and 8, claim 18 as well as claim 20 as amended, recites a determination as to whether a recognition information signal is identical to a "predetermined recognition information signal."

As indicated in arguments below, Applicants submit that claims 15, 18, and 20 are patentable in addition to the patentability of claims 1 and 8.

As disclosed in the present specification, an aspect of the present invention is a display apparatus that receives a recognition information signal and uses the recognition information signal to detect whether "jamming" is occurring due to radio interference with another device using the same frequency. An example of a recognition information signal is an SSID, which is

previously set for a transmitting section and a corresponding receiving section. This aspect is reflected in the claims.

Claims 1 and 8

With regard to the rejection of claims 1 and 8, while not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to advance prosecution of the instant application, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 8 have been amended to include limitations from objected-to allowable claims 2 and 9, respectively. Applicants submit that Ohgami and Cho, either alone or in combination fail to disclose each and every feature recited in claims 1 and 8 as amended.

Claim 15

Claim 15 recites a recognition information signal detection means for detecting a recognition information signal of signals received by the wireless receiving means and a display control means for outputting a signal causing a display means to display information which indicates that it is not possible to receive a video signal. In other words, in the invention of claim 15, a recognition information signal can be received even if it is not possible to receive a video signal, which enables display of display information in a display format according to the recognition information signal.

In Cho, if it is not possible to receive a radio frequency signal (i.e., no signal strength would be indicated), then there would also be no data error rate. In Cho, both the received signal level detector 110 and the interference level detector 114 perform a detection based on the same radio frequency signal. If there is no signal, or a signal cannot be received, there would be no signal received by either of the detectors. Under these circumstances, in Cho, either no RSSI graphic bar would be displayed, or only the small RSSI graphic bar would be displayed, and no interference level graphic bars would be displayed. Thus, Applicants submit that in the case of no radio frequency signal, Cho's radio terminal would not detect a recognition information signal that would be used in changing a display format for displayed display information.

Thus, Applicants submit that Cho does not disclose displaying display information which indicates that it is not possible to receive a video signal and that the display format of the display

information is changed according to a detected recognition information signal, as recited in claim 15.

Claims 18, 20

Claims 18 and 20 as amended recite a step of making a determination as to whether a “recognition information signal” is identified with a wireless transmitting apparatus and is identical to a “predetermined recognition information signal.”

Cho teaches independent display of “data error rate” as an indication of interference level and RSSI as an indication of received signal level so that a user can be correctly informed of the probability of attaining successful communication together with the causes contributing to the probability. Cho discloses that, among other things, color can be used to represent different states of successful communication.

Applicants submit that Cho does not at least disclose a data error rate as a predetermined recognition information signal, such that a determination is made whether or not a recognition information signal is identical to a predetermined recognition information signal.

Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of elements as set forth in independent claims 1, 8, 15, 18, and 20 are not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record for the reasons explained above. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

With regard to dependent claims, Applicants submit that the claims depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claims 1, 8, and 15 which are allowable for the reasons set forth above, and therefore dependent claims are allowable based on their dependence from the independent claims. Reconsideration and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

In view of the above amendment, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Robert W. Downs, Registration No. 48222 at the telephone number of the undersigned below to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Director is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge any fees required during the pendency of the above-identified application or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448.

Dated: March 17, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By Robert Downs # 48222
Charles Gorenstein Robert Downs
Registration No.: 29271
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
703-205-8000